

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-12 are pending in this application with claims 1, 3 – 5, 7 – 9, 11 and 12 being amended by this response. Support for the amendments to claims 1, 5 and 9 may be found throughout the specification and drawing figures and, more specifically, in Figure 1 and on page 6, lines 12 – 21. Claims 3, 4, 7, 8, 11 and 12 are formally amended to provide proper antecedent basis for all features. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added by these amendments.

Rejection of Claims 1 - 12 under 35 USC § 102(e)

Claims 1 - 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wugofski (US Patent 6,003,041). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Independent claim 1 provides a method of performing a channel search implemented in a video processing apparatus having at least two video inputs, each video input able to receive a video signal originating from a respective one of a plurality of external input sources and coupled to a display device. The method includes selecting by a user a video input as a currently selected video input from one of the at least two video inputs, wherein the at least two video inputs are receiving a video signals from different external sources. The method determines if the video signal received on the currently selected video input is at least one of a certain type of video signal and the video signal originates from a certain type of video source. Available channels are detected from various possible channels received from the source connected to only the currently selected video input when the received video signal is at least one of the certain type of video signal and originates from the certain type of video source. A channel list of all channels available for the currently selected video input is updated. For the reasons presented below, it is respectfully submitted that Wugofski fails to teach or suggest each feature of the present claimed arrangement and therefore does not anticipate the present claimed arrangement.

The Decision on Appeal finds that Wugofski discloses that when a new connection is made, the system requests that the user identify the device 120, its port number in multiplexer 130, and its source 110. The system reads a number of characteristics from the device itself and builds a new record containing channel information and therefore detects the available channels from the source connected to only the currently selected video input”. However, Wugofski fails to teach or suggest “selecting by a user a video input as a currently selected video input from one of the at least two video inputs, wherein said at least two video inputs are receiving a video signals from different external source” as recited in the claimed arrangement. Thus, in the claimed arrangement, the inputs are previously identified and are receiving video signals and the channel search method is implemented on signals from known inputs. This is in direct contrast to Wugofski, as found in the Decision on Appeal, whereby the user must manually connect a device and provide signal transmission path (i.e. multiplexer port, etc) in order to facilitate channel list detection.

Wugofski also fails to teach or suggest “determining if said video signal received on said currently selected video input is at least one of a certain type of video signal and said video signal originates from a certain type of video source” as recited in the present claimed arrangement. There is nothing the cited sections of Wugofski relied on in the Decision on Appeal (or elsewhere) that teaches or suggests the present claimed feature. Instead, Wugofski discloses detecting tuning characteristics, i.e. whether or not multiple channels can be tuned. There is nothing in Wugofski that determines if the receive signal on the currently selected input is “at least one of a certain type of video signal and said video signal originates from a certain type of video source” as in the claimed arrangement.

Therefore, as the step of determining signal type and source type is neither taught nor suggested by Wugofski, it follows that Wugofski fails to teach or suggest “detecting available channels from various possible channels received from the source connected to only the currently selected video input **when said received video signal is**

at least one of said certain type of video signal and originates from said certain type of video source” as recited in the present claimed arrangement.

Thus, as each feature of amended claim 1 is neither taught nor suggested by Wugofski, Applicants respectfully submit that Wugofski fails to anticipate the present claimed arrangement. Consequently, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

Claims 2 – 4 are dependent on claim 1 and are considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Wugofski fails to anticipate the present claimed arrangement as claimed in claims 2 - 4. Consequently, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

Independent claim 5 includes features similar to those claimed in amended claim 1 and therefore is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Wugofski fails to anticipate the present claimed arrangement. Consequently, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

Claims 6 – 8 are dependent on claim 5 and are considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 5. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Wugofski fails to anticipate the present claimed arrangement as claimed in claims 6 - 8. Consequently, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

Independent claim 9 includes features similar to those claimed in amended claim 1 and therefore is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Wugofski fails to anticipate the present claimed arrangement. Consequently, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

Claims 10 – 12 are dependent on claim 9 and are considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 9. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Wugofski fails to anticipate the present claimed arrangement as claimed in claims 10 - 12. Consequently, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

In view of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that Wugofski fails to teach or suggest each feature of claims 1, 5 and 9 and therefore does not anticipate claims 1, 5, and 9. Accordingly, as claims 2 – 4, 6 – 8 and 10 - 12 are dependent on claims 1, 5 and 9, respectively, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also not anticipated by Wugofski. Therefore, Applicant further respectfully submits that this rejection has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections, it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's attorney at the phone number below, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

No fee is believed due. However, if a fee is due, please charge the fee to Deposit Account 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,
Gene Harlow Johnson

By: /Catherine A. Cooper/
Catherine A. Cooper
Reg. No. 40,877
Tel. No. (609) 734-6440

Serial No. 10/031,091
Customer No. 24498

Attorney Docket No. RCA89650

Thomson Licensing, LLC.
Patent Operations
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312
May 24, 2010